

Application No. 09/851,460
Attorney Docket No.: 9784-3U2 (TH8002US/B)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 19 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OFFICIAL

In Re Patent Application Of:	:	
Ulrich Reiners et al.	:	
Conf. No.: 4175	:	Group Art Unit: 1773
Appln. No.: 09/851,460	:	Examiner: Kevin R. Kruer
Filing Date: May 8, 2001	:	Attorney Docket No.: 9784-3U2 (TH8002US/B)
Title:	:	
THERMO-FORMABLE MULTILAYER BARRIER FILM WITH THE APPEARANCE AND TEXTURE OF PAPER		

REQUEST FOR NEW OFFICE ACTION AFTER FINAL

This request relates to the final Office Action dated February 13, 2004 (Paper No. 20040203) in the above-identified patent application. This is not a response to the Office Action, but a request for the Examiner to specifically address the arguments and amendments set forth in the Supplemental Amendment of January 14, 2004.

The Office Action of February 13, 2004 was promptly sent to Applicants' corresponding German attorney on February 23, 2004. However, Applicants have complained that they cannot determine how to respond to the Office Action, because the Examiner has not specifically addressed the Amendment of January 14, 2004.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action Summary states that the Office Action is responsive to the communication filed on 30 October 2003 (i.e., Applicants' Request for Reconsideration to the Office Action of April 28, 2003). The beginning of the Examiner's Response to Arguments at page 3 of the Office Action also states that Applicants' arguments filed October 30, 2003 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicants can find no acknowledgement or reference to the Supplemental Amendment filed on January 14, 2004. On the other hand, it appears that the Examiner did receive the Amendment of January 14, since new claims 18, 19 and 20, added by that Amendment, have been added by the Examiner to the rejections in paragraphs 3, 5, 8 and 10 at pages 2 and 3 of the

Application No. 09/851,460
Attorney Docket No.: 9784-3U2 (TH8002US/B)

Office Action (though without comment). The Examiner also states at the bottom of page 3 that the rejection of claim 18 (among others) over Miyazaki under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been overcome by argument, but this statement is not understood, since claim 18 was not previously in the application and therefore could not have been rejected over Miyazaki.

In any event, Applicants can find no statement of the Examiner in the Office Action addressing the January 14 Amendment to claim 1 or the new claims 18-20 or addressing Applicants' remarks in support of these amendments. Therefore, Applicants have no basis on which to ascertain the Examiner's position with respect to these new and amended claims and remarks, and are thus unable to formulate a response to the February 13 Office Action.

Further, Applicants note the Examiner's acknowledgement of the failures in the teachings of Miyazaki, set forth in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. The Examiner concludes this listing by stating that he "will not address these arguments any further since they are deemed not [to] be relevant to the outstanding rejections." Applicants strenuously object to this position of the Examiner, because these arguments are indeed very relevant to the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, they go to the very issue of whether it would have been obvious to combine Miyazaki with any of the other references of record, given that Miyazaki is directed to a completely different type of package, namely a cup, not a film for forming sealing packages. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner specifically address how Miyazaki can be used in obviousness rejections in view of these failings.

Application No. 09/851,460
Attorney Docket No.: 9784-3U2 (TH8002US/B)

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully request a new Office Action fully addressing all of the issues requested above.

Respectfully submitted,

ULRICH REINERS ET AL.

April 19, 2004 By: William W. Schwarze
(Date)

WILLIAM W. SCHWARZE

Registration No. 25,918

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1270

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: wschwarze@akingump.com

WWS/rc

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103

TELEPHONE: (215) 965-1200 - FACSIMILE: (215) 965-1210
E-MAIL: rconti@akingump.com

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 19 2004
OFFICIAL

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted
to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below

Renee Conti

Type or print name of person signing certification

Renee Conti April 19, 2004
Signature Date

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Examiner: Mr. Kevin R. Kruer

FAX No.: 703-872-9306

Group Art Unit: 1773

Date: April 19, 2004

From: William W. Schwarze

FAX Operator:

Re: Thermo-Formable Multilayer Barrier Film with the Appearance and Texture of Paper

Application No. 09/851,460

Filed: May 8, 2001

Title of Paper sent via Facsimile: Request for New Office Action After Final

Time: _____

Akin Gump File No: 209784.0031

Page 1 of 4 pages

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE CONTACT
RENEE CONTI @ AT 215-965-1379.

THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY CONTAIN ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED
INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR COMPANY NAMED ABOVE.

If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately call us so that we may arrange for the return of the original message to us. Thank you!

PAGE 1/4 * RCVD AT 4/19/2004 10:49:53 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFAX-1/1 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):01-28